

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1, 4-9, 12-18 and 21-34 are pending in this application. Claim 34 is added. Claims 2, 3, 10, 11, 19 and 20 are cancelled. Claims 1, 4, 7, 8, 12, 13, 16, 18, 21, 22, 25, 27, 30, 31, 32 and 33 are amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action dated April 2, 2008, claims 1-29 are objected to due to minor informalities. Claims 1-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph due to various antecedent basis issues. Claims 30-33 stand rejected 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-9, 11, 17, 18, 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Elz et al., FTPEXT Working Group, “Extensions to FTP” (“Elz”). Claims 30-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Goyal et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,976,258. Claims 10, 12-15 and 19-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Elz in view of Goyal et al. Claims 16, 25 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Elz in view of Liu et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,898,780.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Interview at the USPTO of June 11, 2008

Applicants’ representative thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the in person interview at the USPTO on June 11, 2008. The claims have been amended, as discussed

during the interview, to incorporate the subject matter of claim 2, 3 and 11 into the independent claims. During the interview, the Examiner indicated that these amendments would overcome the current rejections based on Elz.

Objections to the Claims

A number of claims are objected to due to minor informalities. These claims have been amended to address the objections. Applicants respectfully request that these objections be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

A number of claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, due to various antecedent basis issues. These claims have been amended to address these § 112 rejections. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 30-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In view of the amendments to claim 30, which has been rewritten as depending from claim 18, Applicants believe that the § 101 rejections are now moot.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

A number of claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on Elz. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Support for the language of the amendments regarding the target domain name and the user name being embedded in a single command may be found, for example, in paragraph 0066, as well as in the original claims 1 and 2. Support for the language of the amendment regarding

keeping the wrapper active until the server is identified and the communications handed to the server, and then terminating the wrapper, may be found, for example, in paragraph 0030.

As discussed during the interview, Elz does not discuss a standard communication protocol. Specifically, in its Chapter 6, Elz discusses a proposed “HOST” command. This command is not part of the standard FTP protocol. These proposals by Elz et al. were never adopted, and neither the then-version of FTP nor the current version of FTP contains the new HOST command proposed by Elz. As such, claims 1 and 18, which recite the use of a standard communications protocol, are patentably distinct from Elz based at least on this ground.

Additionally, claims 1 and 18 recite the use of a single command that includes the user name and the domain name, separated by a symbol that is permitted in the protocol. This feature is not disclosed by Elz – in Elz, to accomplish the same thing (even aside from the fact that Elz does not use standard protocol), two separate commands are required – first, the HOST command, and second, a user authentication command. Since two commands have to be transmitted (and responded to by the server), the burden on the server is greater, and the network traffic is higher. Thus, the use of a single command, in the form username%domain or domain%username is clearly distinguishable over Elz.

Additionally, the independent claims have been amended to recite that the wrapper is only active while the request is being identified and communication is then handed to the requested server, and the wrapper is then terminated. This language is based on the language of previously pending claim 11, now cancelled. As discussed during the interview, if the Office Action were to treat the FTP server front end as the claimed wrapper, then this logic would be inconsistent, since the front end in Elz is a “permanent” entity that is not “killed” once

communication is established. Therefore, the independent claims are allowable over Elz for this third, separate reason as well.

Claim 4

Claim 4 has been amended to delete the references to HTTP and FTP. The remainder of the protocols on the list are not disclosed in Elz. Therefore, claim 4 is allowable over Elz for this additional reason as well.

Claim 7

Claim 7 have been amended to recite that the instance of the server is a virtual server. Elz does not disclose this aspect, in combination with the other elements recited in claim 1.

Claim 8

Claim 8 has been amended to recite that multiple servers providing multiple services to multiple clients share the same disk space. Applicants respectfully disagree that Elz discloses this feature, contrary to the statement in the Office Action. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 9

Regarding claim 9, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Elz does not disclose hard links. In Elz, there are different paths to the same file name, and, since it is possible to have multiple paths to the same file, it is not inherent that hard links are used. A file is a group of blocks, such that each block has descriptors, which, in UNIX terms, are referred to as “inodes.” The inode is an association of several descriptors with the same file, which is what hard links pointing to the same physical file are. This is not disclosed in Elz. Reconsideration is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 12

Claim 12 has been amended to recite that a replacement shared library is provided. This language clarifies the previous language “new shared library.” Applicants believe, that with this clarification, claim 12 is clearly distinguishable over Elz. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 17

Claim 17, which relates to provision of secured services in plaintext, is rejected based on Elz. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Elz specifically states that he is not concerned with security or providing services in either plaintext or ciphertext. See, for example, page 57 of Elz:

12. Security Considerations

This memo does not directly concern security. It is not believed that any of the mechanisms documented here impact in any particular way upon the security of FTP.

Reconsideration is therefore respectfully requested for this additional, separate reason.

Rejections of Claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Goyal

Claim 30 has been amended, to make it into a dependent claim. Applicants therefore believe that the rejection based on Goyal of this claim is now moot.

Rejections of Claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Goyal

Claim 32 stands rejected based on Goyal. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Goyal does not disclose reading from the socket directly. Therefore, based at least this aspect, claim 32 is allowable over Goyal or any combination of Elz with Goyal.

Rejections of Claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Goyal

Claim 33 recites that the write command is ignored until the buffer is empty. Goyal, in the cited passage, does not disclose this aspect. This feature was discussed during the interview. If the Examiner continues to maintain the rejection, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner explain in more detail how he interprets the cited passage in Goyal.

Claims 16, 25, 26

Claims 16, 25 and 26 stand rejected based on a combination of Elz with Liu. These rejections are respectfully traversed. Elz, as noted earlier, specifically teaches away from the use of encryption. As such, combining it with Liu in the proposed manner is contrary to what the references themselves teach. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Priority document

Applicants are in the process of obtaining a certified copy of the priority document for submission to the USPTO.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully
requested.

Respectfully submitted,
BARDMESSER LAW GROUP
/GB/

George S. Bardmesser
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,020

Date: July 1, 2008

910 17th Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 293-1191